

## REMARKS

This response is in response to the Office Action mailed August 13, 2008. With this response no claims are amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **I. Interview Summary**

On October 30, 2008 an in person interview was held between Examiner Neil Mclean and the Applicant's representatives Nathan Rau and MacLane Key. During the Interview the present application, claims and cited art were discussed. The following paper is based at least in part on the discussion of the Interview. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for taking time to meet with us to discuss this case.

### **II. Rejections under §102**

In Item 6 of the Office Action claims 1-25 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stringham, U.S. Patent No. 7,394,558 (hereinafter "Stringham"). The Applicant has reviewed the Stringham reference and must respectfully disagree.

The Stringham reference is directed towards a print system whereby a print job clue is sent to the printer. These print job clues provide information about the print job that is about to be sent to the printer. When the printer is ready to accept the print job associated with the print job clue the printer requests that the computer send the print job to the printer. From this point on the computer continues to push the data associated with the print job to the printer until the entire job has been sent to the printer from the computer.

In contrast to the Stringham reference, the present claims require that the printer indicate that it is ready to receive rendering data for the job and that it requests data for

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/733,045  
Attorney Docket Number: 305645.01  
Filing Date: 11 December 2003

the job. This request is a request for some, but not all, of the data in the job. For example, the request may be send the first page of the print job, send the first 100K of the print job, etc. In response to the request for the rendering data the client sends only that information that is requested and awaits additional requests for rendering data from the printer. These additional requests can, for example, take the form of a request for the second page of the print job, the next 100K of the print job, etc. The client continues to respond to the requests for rendering data until the printer has indicated that the print job is complete.

Therefore, at least one difference between the Stringham reference and the present claims is the multiple requests for rendering data for a single print job. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Stringham does not disclose all of the features of the independent claims in their entirety. Therefore, claims 1–25 and 27–31 are believed allowable over Stringham. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the present claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Reconsideration and of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/733,045  
Attorney Docket Number: 305645.01  
Filing Date: 11 December 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: November 13, 2008

By: /Nathan M. Rau/

Nathan M. Rau Reg. No.: 45,466  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (425) 706-6882  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

November 13, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/733,045  
Attorney Docket Number: 305645.01  
Filing Date: 11 December 2003